

1 especially from the OCS, goes to state and federal
2 governments, communities in other parts of the country,
3 and large corporations, many of them foreign-owned.

4 In 1994, a committee of the National
5 Research Council advised the Minerals Management
6 Service that the most effective way to address this
7 imbalance of risks and benefits is to work with our
8 community and the industry to reach agreement on all
9 controversial leasing, exploration and development
10 issues, including the mitigation of impacts and the
11 sharing of benefits.

12 The NRC committee went on to note that
13 one of the two most critical components of the OCS
14 decision-making process in the Arctic is meaningful
15 participation by the subsistence community in the
16 timing and siting of OCS-related industrial operations
17 and facilities. The other component is revenue
18 sharing.

19 As I have pointed out, for more than 25
20 years our community has worked cooperatively to design
21 and implement measures that mitigate the impacts of oil
22 and gas development on our subsistence resources and
23 our way of life.

24 As the NRC recognized, our ability to
25 participate in these decisions, itself, is a mitigation

1 measure since it gives us some ability to participate
2 in the process, as opposed to being helpless bystanders
3 and ultimately victims.

4 And up until now our most important
5 opportunities for participation and for developing
6 other forms of mitigation have been through our coastal
7 management plan.

8 In its EIS, OCRM must identify and
9 evaluate mitigation measures that the federal
10 government will offer to address our community's
11 effective loss of our ability to participate in the
12 management and decision-making process affecting our
13 coastal area.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause)

16 (Anyone speaking away from the
17 microphone at this point is indiscernible due to native
18 singing and music next door)

19 MS. OKASAKI: Did you want to say
20 something?

21 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: Pardon me?

22 MS. OKASAKI: (Indiscernible, away from
23 microphone)

24 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: Oh, no, no. Arnold,
25 Jr. gave my statement to you.....

1 MS. OKASAKI: Okay. (Indiscernible,
2 away from microphone)
3 MAYOR AHMAOGAK:(indiscernible,
4 away from microphone) Mayor Ahmaogak.
5 MS. OKASAKI: (Indiscernible, away from
6 microphone)
7 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: I apologize. But
8 Arnold, Jr. already had my statement.
9 MS. OKASAKI: Yes.
10 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: Okay.
11 MS. OKASAKI: I didn't know if you
12 wanted to say something.....
13 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: But I can.....
14 MS. OKASAKI:a bit more.
15 MAYOR AHMAOGAK:say a few words.
16 MS. OKASAKI: Okay.
17 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: I'm sorry. I came in
18 my rubber boots. How are you doing, Bill?
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. How
20 are you today?
21 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: We've got about 10,000
22 bulls right on our river right now, and we're just
23 picking them like you wouldn't believe. It's unusual
24 to get bulls this time of the year. It just looked
25 like that whole countryside's just moving up there, and

1 that's where I just -- they picked me up from.

2 Teshekpuk Lake area.

3 Coastal Zone Management. I appreciate
4 -- I think Arnold Brower, Jr., one of my special
5 assistants, gave you my statements, written statements
6 already, and I'm happy for that. And I appreciate the
7 public hearing and taking testimony here from our
8 residents concerning changes to the coastal zone
9 management.

10 We have a lot of concern on the coastal
11 zone itself, especially when the legislation came out.
12 I believe at 171, am I correct? The concerns we had
13 was lack of enforcement, no habitat areas of any sort,
14 no local control. These are just some of the items
15 that we had in that legislation. Of course, we had
16 very little time to provide testimony. From my
17 observation that legislation, 171, was ramrodded
18 through the Legislature. That's my understanding, and
19 that's what I learned, and very little bit of testimony
20 was given on that piece of legislation. Hardly any of
21 the coastal districts that I'm aware of provided any
22 changes or tried to put any public comment to that.

23 Now, our concern was local control, the
24 enforcement policies, the habitat, and these areas are
25 some of our concerns that we had. And we kept writing

1 letters also to OCRM, because we couldn't quite get
2 what we wanted out of that legislation. We're very
3 concerned when legislation goes like this and we don't
4 have very much ample time and they're ramrodding it,
5 and not having very much very public hearing across all
6 of the coastal districts, and that's the dilemma that
7 we had.

8 I don't want to put the state of Alaska
9 down to the barrel, but we tried anyway through
10 legislative process, through writing to the governor
11 and working with our legislators to try to make
12 changes, but I'm sure that we didn't receive any
13 changes, and I know that applications were submitted by
14 the state to OCRM. And to us those were significant
15 changes to the coastal zone management plan. I don't
16 think it was a minor adjustment like everybody's
17 claimed. I thought it was a major adjustment.
18 Probably requires a full, as I understand it, a full
19 EIS process. Am I correct there? That's my
20 observation.

21 Rest assured we're going to go and I
22 would ask for all coastal districts be given that ample
23 time to provide public testimony with the changes that
24 is here.

25 We are making -- one of the other

1 dragging points we had was the deadline I believe to
2 submit our plans to the state of Alaska for all these
3 changes. That was another outstanding issue that we
4 had to work on to extend it I believe to July 6th of
5 2006 or so I believe. So the last time we went through
6 coastal zone changes, it took us -- and comply with the
7 state and federal government, it took us more than a
8 year at least from the local setting to pass it on to
9 the state and federal agencies, OCRM, if you will. And
10 this window had requested that -- we wanted that window
11 open and extended, and I think we got that.

12 But our problem with this coastal zone,
13 any time you take local control, enforcement, habitat
14 protections, these are only some of the real concerns
15 that we've got.

16 I've dealt with the oil and gas
17 industry for quite some time, and coastal zone is our
18 only tool available to try to mitigate some of the
19 adverse impacts that is here from the local
20 communities. Coastal zone management is our only
21 authority. I can't think of any other piece of
22 legislation that I could think of that we could hang
23 our hat to force the operators to, hey, listen to some
24 of these adverse impacts and let's talk mitigation. In
25 other words, we need some authority to let them come to

1 the table and address these impacts. Social impacts,
2 cultural impacts, economic impacts of all types are
3 certainly there. Cultural impacts, whaling,
4 subsistence impacts are -- were certainly there, for
5 many of the operators that are out there in offshore
6 areas. And coastal zone was our way of trying to
7 control some of that exploration and development that
8 takes place out there. That was the only authority
9 that we had.

10 Now, if you take the local control,
11 enforcement and all of these other issues out of there,
12 then we have nothing to force the operator on the table
13 to negotiate and deal with those, and mitigate those
14 adverse impacts.

15 Now, the only thing that we had -- the
16 only other item that we tend to use was the Marine
17 Mammal Protection Act, which through -- the operator
18 had to get a federal permit from the Office of
19 Protected Species, and that's the only other federal
20 authority that is here, under the Marine Mammal
21 Protection Act. Once they go to the Office of
22 Protected Species, where it's the operator, like
23 Conoco, has to get a permit to operate outside. That
24 calls for conflict avoidance agreements before they
25 even issued the permit, from the Office of Protected

1 Species.

2 That was our only other authority that
3 we had to try to control some of the development that
4 takes place out in the offshore areas, and especially
5 in the inland rivers also. This is just not talking
6 about offshore areas. We're talking about inland, too,
7 in some of the rivers that people depend on
8 subsistence.

9 But getting back, and I hope that this
10 changes that are submitted by the state of Alaska
11 adheres to some of the local control, enforcement,
12 habitat protection, and all of these things we keep
13 saying. Otherwise we have no leg to stand on. All the
14 development will be rushed, ramrodded, and we wouldn't
15 have no control, none whatsoever for subsistence, for
16 social or any other use, cultural impacts that we would
17 have. Coastal zone was our only authority.

18 Now, I keep hearing that the Coastal
19 Zone Management Act, I'm not going to point any names
20 at all, but they've been pointing at the Borough, to
21 us, from the local municipality and saying that we're
22 the problem that slows down some of the producers or
23 operators that are offshore through the coastal zone
24 management when they apply through our local districts
25 for -- under the coastal zone management under our

1 ordinance. What was the hanging spot of it was, or
2 what dragged things out is when we had some of these
3 appellant. When a consistency determination was made,
4 some of these environmentalists, conservationists would
5 file for an appeal to try to overturn the consistency
6 determination, and in fact it slowed down development.
7 That's what it did.

8 But when you're looking at it from the
9 North Slope Borough implementing the coastal zone
10 management and giving them, the operators, what they
11 wanted, that wasn't the slowing process. It was the
12 appeal process that slowed the whole thing down, when
13 the enviros (ph) and the conservationists appealed that
14 consistency determination at the local level. They can
15 appeal. It's not changing statutory authority to
16 streamline things. That's a proper poor way of looking
17 at it in my book.

18 The coastal zone as it was from the
19 local districts was operating fine. We were spitting
20 out permits under the coastal zone just like you
21 wouldn't believe. There was nothing dragging them.
22 But it was that appeal process where under our
23 ordinance the conservation -- those are some of the
24 loopholes also in the statutory language from the state
25 of Alaska that is there. That is the process that

1 slowed the whole process down. But it wasn't a normal
2 process once application is received, and issuing out a
3 permit from the coastal zone. That was just
4 expeditious in my book. But it -- the appealing
5 process.

6 And when I saw 171, and they're saying,
7 well, we want to speed -- my thought was they were
8 going -- they were want to speed -- streamline the
9 whole process, so they take out local enforcement and
10 all of these other issues, that we really pay attention
11 to. That was our only leg to stand on. Enforcement,
12 habitat, and all of these other things. But yet it was
13 the appellant process when the conservationists or
14 Friends of the Earth or somebody like that appealed.
15 they're no friend of mind, I'll tell you that. I've
16 locked once with them before. But when they appeal,
17 that was what was dragging the feet.

18 Now, I'm hoping that OCRM would really
19 take into consideration some of the public testimony
20 that is going to have to take place with this 171. I
21 think we've convinced the state. I've talked to the
22 commissioner, Tom Owen, about it, and we sat down with
23 our staff and educate him where the problems were at.
24 And by God, Tom finally understood. I think the last
25 meeting they had in Anchorage when they had some of the

1 coastal district -- before they had that meeting, our
2 staff came in there and showed them, this is how it
3 operates from our level, from the local districts, and
4 the commissioner finally woke up. We've been working
5 with the commissioner, and I think the commissioner
6 truly understands now, but I'm still leery of what the
7 application is there. I would like to take another
8 look of, to see if any of those concerns are still
9 outstanding out there.

10 If we take local control, local
11 enforcement, habitat protection and all of these out,
12 we're dead in the water. Who's going to do the
13 mitigation? Who's going to address the impacts? How
14 are you going to force the operator to get out there
15 and address these issues? I could tell you right now
16 we -- there's no authority for us to stand on from the
17 local level. And if things like that, the federal
18 agencies and the state and the local communities all
19 work together, I think we can come up with some
20 solutions. I'm not going to cut anybody down, but I
21 think we're still here, we're still going through this
22 process to make improvements, but no matter what you
23 do, don't cut out the municipalities. Don't do it on
24 the backs of municipalities. Even though I respect the
25 state, let's do it where everybody can live with each

1 other, and we'll have a pretty good piece of
2 legislation, and I've got to look at the state's
3 application a little bit more further, but that's the
4 sound -- that's about the way that I view things from
5 my -- from being a mayor, I've been -- gone through
6 these coastal zone for the last 15 years, and dealing
7 with offshore issues.

8 One issue that we had I believe, we had
9 an operator that was offshore and they were filing for
10 consistency determination from our borough, and the
11 exploratory drilling was going to happen right at the
12 shear zone of where the bowhead wells were migrating.
13 And they wanted to put a 10,000 gallon tank I believe,
14 or 5,000 gallon diesel tank, and some heavy equipment
15 that is out there. Our municipality said, heck, no.
16 No, it's not consistent with what we feel, because
17 you're too close to the shear zone, meaning where the
18 land-fast ice and the circulating ice pack opens up in
19 and out. The borough made a declaration and said it's
20 not consistent. Because of that 10, 5,000 gallon tank,
21 if that ice rubble starts up, you know where that tank
22 was going to go. It was going to go into the ice, and
23 the diesel spill was going to go all over. So the
24 borough made a finding that said, it's nonconsistent.
25 Issues like that really woke my eyes up, because the

1 operator.....

2 The other thing they wanted to do was
3 to build up a drilling platform using ice, pumping
4 saltwater ice, and then building it several layers.
5 And once that ice hits it from the circulating ice
6 pack, you can say good-bye to that drilling rig that's
7 going to be on top of it.

8 These were some of the issues that we
9 had to make these issues. And we made a nonconsistency
10 determination on those, because we know that ice in and
11 out like the back of our hands. We're whalers. We've
12 got prior use and occupancy out there. We know this
13 area.

14 So for whatever it's worth, and I urge
15 OCRM to take a -- and the state, we need to work
16 together. I think we could come up to some solution.
17 So I'm not cutting down anybody. But don't do it on
18 the backs of municipalities. We need that authority.
19 We need to force the operator to come out here and meet
20 us at the table. And I appreciate Conoco being right
21 here. Because we've worked with them before, and I
22 don't want to slow down the process. We support
23 exploration and development, but when it goes offshore,
24 the borough's position has been no support for any
25 offshore exploration and development, period. But we

1 work things around through coastal zone if we can do
2 that. That's our only leg to force the operator.
3 Maybe we can mitigate something. Conflict avoidance
4 agreements. Good neighbor policies.

5 Good neighbor policy is the first one
6 that -- policy that we developed for British Petroleum.
7 You know, it's what, six miles off shore. Four, five
8 miles. We made a consistency determin -- I mean a
9 conflict avoidance agreement that calls for -- on MMPA,
10 on the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the North Star.
11 The second one was a good neighbor policy that we
12 developed with BP.

13 The worst -- every offshore testimony
14 that you hear regarding any offshore exploration and
15 development, one of those deep concerns is an oil
16 spill. Noise impact. Subsistence impact. On and on
17 for how many years that I know. And the Minerals
18 Management oil spill risk model that they developed
19 were using Gulf of Mexico standards in Arctic
20 conditions. Our North Slope Borough scientific
21 advisory committee said that this MMS oil spill risk
22 analysis, or in the formula developed, but in that EIS
23 for the North Star was totally inadequate. And we have
24 copies if you need copies of that. But the point I'm
25 getting back to the North Star is when I mention a good

1 neighbor policy, the community, AEW, the North Slope
2 Borough, some of the whaling captains got together and
3 we said, BP, we're worried about having an oil spill
4 out there. What about a good neighbor policy? So good
5 neighbor policy was to address any major oil spill if
6 it happens on that island. Small case scenario or
7 worst case scenario. We made some estimates of our
8 subsistence losses that we would have. We tried to
9 calculate that from the local level, looking at the
10 ooruk (ph), looking at the seal, looking at the whales,
11 looking at what these Eskimos put on the dinner table
12 each and every year, starting from Kaktovik, Nuiqsut,
13 Barrow and right out -- right on down the line, but for
14 small case scenario BP posted \$20 million financial
15 assurance in Wells Fargo Bank for the good neighbor
16 policy. But the 20 million is still on the balance
17 sheets of BP and it's their property. Only it becomes
18 the community's property when they declare an oil spill
19 that has happened, and we use that money to take the
20 subsistence hunters elsewhere to do their harvesting of
21 subsistence hunting. Ooruk, seal, polar bear, whale.
22 And that's what we were going to use that money. It's
23 already posted right here at Wells Fargo. BP signed a
24 financial assurance.

25 And if it was a worst case scenario

1 then all the communities and all parties, stakeholders,
2 would come together and try to make a dollar assessment
3 in how many impacted communities this oil spill would
4 affect. BP signed that.

5 And this is our way of trying to
6 mitigate oil spills if it happens in the Arctic.

7 And we've been dealing with these oil
8 and gas industries. I think there's ways that we're --
9 our position is known to offshore, but if we take
10 coastal zone away from us, we've got nothing to stand
11 on. No authority. We can't force the operator to come
12 on the table and talk about subsistence impact,
13 cultural impact, social impact.

14 Some of these people, our resident,
15 have lack of skill, meaning they can't even get an
16 eight to five job. They're not trained. They depend
17 on subsistence food. They go out to the ocean, they go
18 out to the rivers like where I'm at, and put food on
19 the table. And when they hear about offshore
20 development that takes place such as North Star or any
21 offshore development, these people start saying -- and
22 start losing confidence in themselves, because now they
23 can't provide any more food on the table for their
24 family. What do you think they do? Drugs, alcohol,
25 because you're going into a depression. That's why

1 we've got the substance abuse treatment centers,
2 counseling centers, detox centers and so forth. Their
3 fear of their world is crashing and caving in, and some
4 day he's not going to eat any more muktuk, he's not
5 going to eat any more polar bear. He can't put meat on
6 that table any more. He's got a social problem. And
7 the local community has to deal with that from
8 something that happens offshore. This is what we're
9 going through in the real world today, folks. It's a
10 real tough situation.

11 And being offshore, and I'm a whaler,
12 I'm a whaling captain. I've harvested quite a few
13 whales, especially in the falltime. When we have to go
14 -- normally we used to go only five miles out to get a
15 bowhead whale. And then when there's offshore impact
16 from seismic or from direct barge operations, those
17 whales are now 30 miles out. Now I've got to dig
18 deeper in my pocket to buy more gas to go further out.
19 And guess what, it gets real rough out there. Ten-foot
20 swells, 12-foot swells, going about five knots. These
21 are direct impact related issues that are coming out
22 from the activity from Prudhoe. Remember, the whales
23 are coming from the Canadian waters going west in the
24 falltime. And we're the last ones at the totem pole to
25 harvest these bowhead whales coming in from the

1 Canadian Arctic. We used to go just five miles right
2 off the point, I wish I had a map here, and harvest a
3 bowhead whale, just -- if there was no activity
4 offshore, none whatsoever. Now we've got to go 30
5 miles and then when we do reach them, they're skittish.
6 They're spooked. Their reaction is real different.
7 They're sensitive. And these people are wanting this
8 food for the rest of the winter to feed their -- to put
9 them in the ice cellar. They don't have jobs, eight to
10 five jobs like we do. And you take that away and then
11 when the guy feels that impact -- I see it firsthand
12 myself, being a whaling captain.

13 I can't stop offshore oil and gas, and
14 I don't think none of us can. But these coastal zone
15 and these changes are very important to us to maintain
16 our subsistence lifestyle. We must address those
17 impacts and make financial resources available.
18 There's only one piece of energy-related legislation
19 that addresses impacts, and that's the National
20 Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and they provide impact funds
21 from any exploration and development on National
22 Petroleum Reserve. Impact funds are available to
23 impacted communities at the local level. We don't get
24 impact aid from the state of Alaska. We don't get
25 impact aid from any other -- like Minerals Management

1 for offshore exploration and development. Just the
2 National Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and it's on the land.

3

4 We tried numerous times to make changes
5 to the outer continental shelf legislation to provide
6 some funding for these impact aid. Now it's the
7 community that has to deal with these impacts.

8 I'm going to stop right there, and I
9 think Arnold, Jr. gave you the rest of my testimony,
10 but I'm still leery, folks. Even though we have
11 application, even though we're going through public
12 testimony. What's going to come out in the end? I
13 hope that we don't get cut off at the knees. I really
14 hope that we don't. Because I want those operators on
15 the table, like Conoco, like this guy, Mike Majors, up
16 there talking right to them and saying, hey, you've got
17 to address these impacts. The irony is, it's the oil
18 and gas agencies that provide oil and gas leases. They
19 don't provide the funds. They don't want to address
20 these areas, but they leave it to the operator. Here
21 it should be the people that lease the offshore areas
22 to address these issues. But, no, now it's the
23 community and the operator. But you take OCR -- you
24 take this coastal zone, then we've got nothing. Then
25 the operators are going to say, what the heck do we

1 need to meet you for? I don't want to get to that
2 level.

3 So I appreciate you all coming up here,
4 taking testimony. We tried so hard. We called for
5 testimony up here, and I'm sure people across the
6 coastal states are starving to have you guys visit
7 their community and provide testimony. And I think
8 that before any changes, major changes go through and I
9 hope you go through that process, because to me right
10 now, I want to work with the state. I want to work
11 with the federal agencies. I think we can come up with
12 solutions. And we can work in that direction and rest
13 assured, through EIS process we'll be providing public
14 comment. I'm tired of letter writing campaign to OCRM
15 and telling them my problems with this piece of HB 171,
16 and the changes that are taking place. Public hearing
17 in the coastal districts is very important. If we
18 can't have that process at the state level, legislative
19 process, and I appreciate OCRM coming up here to
20 provide us that. And you're the only ones that can
21 come up here and give us this opportunity for Christ's
22 sakes. So we're very serious about this coastal zone.
23 Don't do it off the backs of municipalities. Don't
24 take their authority away. Don't chop them off at
25 their knees.

1 We'll be happy if it stays like that.
2 New additional changes on the coastal zone. We've got
3 until July to fix up our coastal zone and submit them
4 to the state. We're probably going to have to work
5 with the state to get them approved and then we've got
6 to go through the federal process for those changes
7 that we've got to make. It's a long, tedious process.
8 And the last change -- the first time we enacted our
9 coastal zone, that took a lot of time and public
10 hearing all over. Public hearing galore. And I hate
11 -- that's why this process needs time when we make
12 changes to our plans to be done by 2006 or 2007. It
13 takes time.

14 I'd like to see you guys flying when
15 it's 30, 40, 50 below out there, having public hearings
16 in the villages, wondering if you're going to come back
17 home. I mean, it's rough out there. It's not as easy,
18 just like on a commercial jet here. No way. You're
19 going out there with a little bush plane.

20 But thank you for coming and I think we
21 need to keep close contact, allow for public hearing,
22 and the opportunity to say some things. I'm very
23 grateful for that. At least something we can talk
24 about. But I think we can fix it and find solutions.
25 And if we could do it in the area of compromise and

1 civility, that's what we ought to work on. Thank you
2 very much for allowing me to talk, although Arnold, Jr.
3 gave my statements. So I don't want to talk here all
4 day long, take up your day. You can see I want to go
5 back fishing.

6 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

7 (Applause)

8 MAYOR AHMAOGAK: Is there anybody else
9 now?

10 SEN. OLSON: I'm Donald Olson, the
11 state senator from the area. It starts at the Canadian
12 Border, goes all the way down to the -- just above
13 Nunivak Island there.

14 And one of the things that we saw in
15 this last Legislature was that this -- changes to the
16 coastal zone management plan was one of those very
17 sensitive issues that was controversial to a certain
18 degree. There were people that were hard over on one
19 side and other people that were hard over on the other
20 side. Certainly the Administration made its move, and
21 those of us that were out here where the rubber hits
22 the road, we made our move. And there certainly wasn't
23 a lot of agreement necessarily that was going on.

24 And the reason for that is many people
25 that were in charge of what the legislation had to do

1 with were not people that were in direct contact or
2 lived out in that part of the state, that lived out in
3 that area where the marine mammals, the animals that
4 they live off of and that they eat are getting their
5 food from. And because of that, there was this
6 passionate plea by people that were out there.....

7 And one thing I want to say, first of
8 all, and I should have said this before I spoke, the
9 limited number of people that you see here is no
10 reflection of what the concern is about this issue that
11 is affecting us all. And many of the people that you
12 don't see here are out there harvesting some of what
13 the natural resources are this afternoon, out there in
14 this very area that we're dealing with and having to go
15 ahead and try and look at.

16 Obviously up here industry is
17 represented by the oil and the petroleum products.
18 Down where I was born and raised, Nome, we've seen what
19 industry has done for the last number of years when it
20 was related to gold mining. And there you see what has
21 happened for the last hundred years. When gold was
22 first discovered there 100 years ago, and we started to
23 go ahead and see some of the development that was
24 there, there are relics -- in the springtime you can
25 see where the water changes color, because of this dye

1 that was there that happened from some of the mining
2 left over stuff that we don't even know what it is.

3 You dig up some of the earth from when
4 the military was there, and it's got these oil spills
5 where these underground pipelines and debris that was
6 buried during the war effort. Now, certainly we all
7 realize that war is a very important thing. But there
8 has to be an element of responsibility for those people
9 that put stuff there to make sure that it doesn't harm
10 the people that are going to be there for generations
11 to come.

12 And the same way we have the people --
13 or what we see the legislation doing is the
14 Administration has put forth legislation, House Bill
15 191 which has to do with something that is, we feel,
16 contrary to the best interest of those people that are
17 living here now. And those people that are to come,
18 and generations to come. And because of that, it's one
19 of those things that we feel are very important. I
20 flew up from Nome, I've got my aide up here from
21 Kotzebue, just because of that.

22 Farther down the coast you've got the
23 fishing industry, very vital, that I represent as well.
24 Part of the area that I represent also is three miles
25 from Russia, and we've all seen some of the disastrous

1 industrial accidents, and not even accidents, some of
2 the waste that's gone on over there that affected the
3 reindeer herds, that affected the fish that are going
4 up the river to spawn, that affected the marine mammals
5 that are out there. It's one of those things that
6 needs to be taken very seriously.

7 Right now as we look at some of the
8 experiments that the U.S. government has, that started
9 with the military bases, right now they're having a
10 cleanup at Northeast Cape (ph) and that's fresh on my
11 mind, because in the little town of Golovin we are
12 being affected by the cleanup efforts that are going on
13 out there. Thank God they are being cleaned up.
14 Hopefully they will be cleaned up in a responsible
15 manner that has the least amount of impact to those --
16 the marine life that goes through there, because
17 everything that comes up here goes through the Bering
18 Straits. It's roughly 60 miles across.

19 Part of the area that I represent is
20 Diomede, and they are very sensitive. It's only three
21 miles from the Russian Big Diomede.

22 So as we look at that, we want to make
23 sure that 5, 10, 20, 50 years down the way that we have
24 prepared a pathway for people to have local input, for
25 people to say, yes, we want -- we can -- we are in

1 favor of this; no, we're not in favor of this, and then
2 try and work out something that's beneficial to all
3 people involved.

4 Now, certainly, I'm a businessman. I
5 own five corporations, and I have a pretty good idea on
6 how the businessman's mind worked. And one of the
7 issues that I've always been up against is what the
8 bottom line is. But there has to be a balance between
9 what's good for the economy and what's good for those
10 people that are directly affected by the animals that
11 they are harvesting out there. To make sure that -- as
12 a physician, I have certainly seen a number of genetic
13 diseases that are -- that have been brought about by
14 some of the environmental and some of the, I guess,
15 lack of concern from that standpoint.

16 So with that, I want to make sure -- I
17 want to thank you for coming up here. I certainly was
18 one of the proponents to try and extend the -- extend
19 some of the expiration dates of the legislation that
20 was going through, and I was thankful that there was at
21 least another ear to listen to what our concerns were
22 out there and related to this very, very sensitive
23 matter. Thank you very much.

24 (Applause)

25 MS. OKASAKI: Last chance.

1 MR. SMITH: Well, we're here until four
2 or five.
3 MS. OKASAKI: Until five.
4 MR. SMITH: Until five so we'll still
5 be around.
6 MS. OKASAKI: Yeah. Thank you very
7 much for coming.
8 MR. SMITH: Thank you.
9 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)
10

C E R T I F I C A T E

1

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

4) ss.

5 STATE OF ALASKA)

6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for
8 the state of Alaska, and reporter for Computer Matrix
9 Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

10 THAT the foregoing EIS Scoping Meeting on the
11 Alaska Coastal Management Plan was electronically
12 recorded by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the
13 25th day of July 2005, commencing at the Heritage
14 Center in Barrow, Alaska;

15 That this hearing was recorded electronically and
16 thereafter transcribed under my direction and reduced
17 to print;

18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
19 and affixed my seal this 10th day of August 2005.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 3/12/08